

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-17 were pending in the application. Claims 10 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 12 and 14 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 13, 15, and 17 are currently pending in the application.

Double Patenting Rejections:

Claims 1-2 and 4-17 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting. Claims 10 and 16 have been cancelled, while claims 12 and 14 were withdrawn from consideration. With respect to the remaining claims, terminal disclaimers are attached herewith to obviate the double patenting rejections.

Objection to the Drawings:

The drawings were objected to. A first objection was made for the drawings not being properly crosshatched. A second objection was made for the drawings not showing the stiffener as recited in claim 16. With respect to the objection for crosshatching, a Request for drawing changes along with an amended set of drawings is attached herewith. Applicant notes that the crosshatching has been changed for the drawings in accordance with MPEP 608.02.

With respect to the objection related to the stiffener recited in claim 16, Applicant notes that this claim has been cancelled, and therefore believes this objection to now be moot.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections:

Claims 10, 11, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 11 has been amended. Applicant submits that the amended version of claim 11 meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph. Claims 10 and 16 have been cancelled, therefore their rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is now believed moot.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection:

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 13, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankeny, U.S. Patent 5,691,041, in view of Smith, U.S. Patent 5,694,297. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The cited references, taken singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the independent claims. Frankeny teaches a socket for attaching a flip chip die or ball grid array devices to a printed circuit board substrate having a pattern of solder covered lands, with resources for removing the flip chip die or ball grid array device, resources for directly aligning the solder balls of the flip chip die or ball grid array device to the printed circuit board, resources for using an interposer of dendrite coated vias or pads to electrically and physically connect the solder balls of the flip chip die or ball grid array devices to the solder deposits of the printed circuit board, resources for having the interposer reconfigure the wiring for testing or replacement purposes, resources for utilizing the flexibility and resilience of the interposer to improve dendrite connections, and resources for heat sinking the flip chip die or ball grid array device by direct thermal contact. The socket applies an evenly distributed force to connect the aligned flip chip die or ball grid array device solder ball pattern to the underlying printed circuit board solder deposit pattern through dendrite penetration of the solder using an interposer situated between and aligned to each such solder pattern.

Smith teaches a mounting structure for providing DC power to an IC package is disclosed. The mounting structure comprises a socket for receiving an IC package, having one or more IC chips, and a power supply for supplying at least one specified DC voltage to the IC package. The power supply is coupled to the IC package by conductive paths formed in the socket.

In contrast, Applicant teaches a power laminate for providing core power to an integrated circuit. Independent claim 1 recites, in pertinent part:

“a power for providing core power to the integrated circuit, wherein the power laminate includes a plurality of plane pairs, wherein each of the plurality of plane pairs includes a power plane and a reference plane, and wherein the power laminate is separate from the PCB” (Emphasis added).

Applicant submits that the cited references, taken singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 1. In particular, Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in either of the cited references of a power laminate having a plurality of plane pairs wherein each plane pair includes a power plane and a reference plane. Applicant submits that the standard for obviousness has not been met. Accordingly, removal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5181-71501/BNK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,

Erik A. Heter
Reg. No. 50,652
~~AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)~~

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 3/4/03